

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

ORDER :

*Motion denied.*

*John Bryant,*  
USMJ

Samuel Jefferson

Plaintiff,

v.

Corizon Health Care Providers; et al.

Defendant

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 3:12-cv-0988

Judge Sharp  
Magistrate Judge Bryant

**DEFENDANT ELI LILLY AND COMPANY'S MOTION  
TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S "RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT ELI LILLY AND  
COMPANY'S ANSWER TO AMENDED COMPLAINT"**

Defendant Eli Lilly and Company ("Lilly") requests an order striking Plaintiff's submission entitled "PLAINTIFF SAMUEL JEFFERSON'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT ELI LILLY AND COMPANY'S ANSWER TO AMENDED COMPLAINT" [Docket No. 141] (the "Submission") on the grounds that it is unintelligible and is not recognized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Notwithstanding a litigant's *pro se* status, a motion to strike should be granted where it is impossible to understand the submission in question. *See, e.g., Mann v. Swiggett*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 163347, \*3-4 (E.D.N.C. Oct. 9, 2012) (noting that the district judge had granted a motion to strike because the *pro se* litigant had "continued to clutter the docket with nonsensical filings and continued to disregard this court's orders, the local rules, and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure"); *Lincoln Diagnostics, Inc. v. Panatrex, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41649, \*53 (C.D. Ill. May 29, 2008) (granting a party's motion to strike where the pleading was "essentially 'unintelligible'").